



September 22, 2009

Lester Snow  
Department of Water Resources  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Re: Request for reconsideration of the RAP denial of the LA Gateway IRWM JPA Authority  
(Gateway Authority)

Dear Director Snow:

I was surprised to learn of DWR's preliminary denial of the Gateway Authority as a Regional Water Management Group (RWMG). It is particularly distressing that the Recommendation Summary stated: *...the rationale for forming a separate IRWM Region, exclusive of the GLAC IRWM Region, is not compelling. Therefore, DWR does not approve the Gateway Region.* I am curious to understand how their lack of a "compelling rationale" is an appropriate barometer to judge the importance of the Gateway IRWM Joint Powers Authority's existence. Please be reminded that:

- The Gateway Authority was formed at the direction of the Gateway Council of Governments (COG). I support this action and would go so far as to say the intent of the locally elected officials to represent the people of the Gateway Cities would be undermined.
- The Gateway Authority, even in its short life, has a successful record of effective governance and integrated planning for regional water needs. [Currently, the Gateway Authority secured a \$10 million grant to improve water quality in the Los Angeles River and is administering a Metals TMDL monitoring and implementation plan in the San Gabriel River.]
- DWR's assertion that there is boundary overlap with the Greater Los Angeles County group is a matter of perspective. I see not a 100% overlap; as a separate entity it is 0% overlap.
- The Gateway IRWM Authority clearly meets the minimum qualification for a RWMG as defined in the State Water Code.
- The Gateway Region includes 27 cities, the water wholesaler Central Basin MWD, and the region's groundwater quality advocate, the Southeast Water Coalition. *None of the cities in this region have consented to regional water management representation by any other agency.* Indeed 15 of the COG entities are dues-paying members of the Gateway Authority to ensure that their voices are heard. The others have indicated their member status will

change as soon as their budgets recover (which should be co-incident to the state's recovery and subsequent release of bond funds which support IRWM activities).

- The Gateway Region is a vast area: its two million people comprise nearly 6% of the state. It also represents the highest concentration of minority and disadvantaged communities in Southern California. To equitably address regional water needs, it is imperative that the region maintain strong local leadership in water management issues.

There is a historic and well documented neglect of the Gateway Region by larger County planning efforts. This has also been acknowledged in the Recommendations: *The GLAC IRWM Region must effectively and equitably integrate the Gateway participants into the GLAC Region planning and implementation efforts. Additional effort is needed by GLAC to address trust issues with Gateway participants.* Because the Recommendations approve the GLAC region, and there are no conditions tagged to this statement, I do not see a remedy.

I respectfully urge you to reconsider the preliminary RAP decision and give the Gateway Authority its approval—or provide a more suitable explanation as to why their application is being denied. If you any questions please feel free to contact me in my District Office at (562)989-2919.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Warren T. Furutani". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'W'.

WARREN T. FURUTANI  
Assemblymember, 55<sup>th</sup> District